

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

March 8, 2001

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Walter Lemon III called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Walter Lemon III; Board Members Hal Beighley, Anissa Crane, Monty Edberg and Ronald Nardoza. Board Members Ashetra Prentice and Stewart Straus were excused.

Senior Planner John Osterberg, City Transportation Engineer Randy Wooley, City Utilities Engineer David Winship, Engineering Technician II Charlie Harrison, Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Lemon read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

OLD BUSINESS:

CONTINUANCES:

Chairman Lemon opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the meeting. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

A. BDR 99-00231 -- HOME DEPOT

(Continued from January 25, 2001)

Request for Design Review approval of a proposed commercial project, including a new approximately 105,500 square foot commercial building, a 14,700 square foot garden center, a 194 space parking structure, sidewalks and associated

landscaping on approximately 7.82 acres of land located at 5150 SW Western Avenue. The development proposal is located on Assessor's Map 1S1-14CB, Tax Lots 1000 and 1100, and is zoned Campus Industrial (CI), with a Development Control Area (DCA) overlay district.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson observed that the applicant has requested a continuance until April 26, 2001.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Edberg **SECONDED** a motion that BDR 99-00231 – Home Depot Type 3 Design Review be continued to a date certain of April 26, 2001.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. BDR 2000-0185 -- MURRAY HILL CHRISTIAN CHURCH ADDITION

The land use application has been submitted for consideration for the proposed expansion of Murray Hills Christian Church, including the building design, landscaping and other site development conditions, at an existing church facility, located at 15050 SW Weir Road, and generally located west of SW 148th Avenue and south of SW Weir Road. Site grading is proposed to the southern portion of the site to accommodate the proposed building addition and to modify the existing on-site storm water quality facility, and the proposed church addition is intended to match the existing building architecture. No expansion to the existing parking lot area is proposed, and landscaping is proposed on the southern portion of the site. The site is specifically identified on Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-32AA, Lot 400 and is approximately 3.89 acres in size. The subject property is zoned urban Standard Density (R-5), where churches and related facilities are permitted as a conditional use.

Mr. Ryerson observed that the applicant has requested a continuance until April 26, 2001.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Edberg **SECONDED** a motion that BDR 2000-0185 – Murray Hill Christian Church Addition Type 3 Design Review be continued to a date certain of April 26, 2001.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

CONTINUANCES:

B. BDR2000-0165 -- SW MILLIKAN WAY EXTENSION

(Continued from February 8, 2001)

A proposal to extend SW Millikan Way from its current terminus at SW Hocken Avenue to a connection with SW Cedar Hills Boulevard at SW Henry Street. In addition, the applicant is proposing associated improvements on SW Hocken Avenue, Electric Street, Lloyd Avenue, and Henry Street including intersection improvements, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, utilities, lighting and landscaping. The development proposal affects 16 individual tax lots. The development proposal is located on Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-09DC Tax Lots 300, 900, 1000, 1100; Map 1S1-16AB Tax Lots 400, 500, 501, 600, 601, 700, 800, 900, 1900, 2500; Map 1S1-16BA Tax Lot 2700 and Map 1S1-09CD Tax Lot 1000.

Senior Planner John Osterberg discussed the previous Public Hearing on this issue, observing that there had been a continuance for the consideration of two primary issues, specifically the connection between Lloyd Avenue, SW Henry Street and SW Millikan Way; and the construction of a mid-block crossing to provide for GTE employees who could conceivably park on the south side of Millikan Way and would like to avoid walking the distance to cross at the light at Cedar Hills Boulevard. He discussed written testimony received since the first Public Hearing, from Timothy Ramis, on behalf of Lanphere Enterprises, regarding the landscaping plan and access to the Lanphere site. He mentioned that City Transportation Engineer Randy Wooley is available to respond to any questions or comments.

City Transportation Engineer Randy Wooley observed that staff has reviewed the concerns regarding this issue, adding that because Henry Street and Lloyd Avenue would have very low traffic volumes, he felt that the revised connection proposed by the applicant could work satisfactorily, which addresses the concerns of staff who support the project. He pointed out that in the interest of pedestrian safety, staff would like to discourage the crossing of pedestrians mid-block, emphasizing that providing a pedestrian with greater and possibly false sense of security would not necessarily slow down drivers. Concluding, he offered to respond to any questions or comments.

Chairman Lemon suggested the possibility of locating signs in this parking area advising pedestrians not to cross.

Observing that this has not been done in the past, Mr. Wooley advised Chairman Lemon that staff is considering something of this nature on a separate project. He pointed out that staff would prefer not to commit themselves to this action at this particular time until further information has been obtained about the final design of the parking lot.

APPLICANT:

AL BARKOULI, representing *David Evans & Associates*, discussed the connection between SW Henry Street and SW Millikan Way, emphasizing that the applicant had given a considerable deal of thought to both issues. He provided illustrations and explanations of the applicant's proposed solutions, and described both the advantages and disadvantages of these proposals. He discussed the proposed solution for the connection between Lloyd Avenue, Henry Street and Millikan Way as providing a right-out only on Lloyd Avenue, and the proposed solution for the mid-block crossing as the construction of a raised median with no marked crosswalk. Concluding, he emphasized the applicant's primary concern with public safety, and offered to respond to any comments or questions.

Observing that 90% of accidents involving pedestrians occur at street crossings, Mr. Nardozza questioned where else pedestrian accidents would occur. He expressed his concern with splitting the parking lot, which he feels is unrealistic.

Mr. Barkouli emphasized that the applicant's major concern is with public safety, agreeing that from an engineer's perspective, he would not recommend this split parking lot and would discourage such an action, if at all possible.

Mr. Nardozza commented that he would feel more comfortable if information regarding the long-term intentions of GTE were available.

Mr. Barkouli agreed that it is unfortunate that GTE's long-term intentions are not known at this time.

Mr. Nardozza expressed his approval of the solution for the connection between Lloyd Avenue, Henry Street and Millikan Way.

Chairman Lemon mentioned that he had received a communication from Mr. Straus expressing concern with the retaining walls and the mid-block traffic-crossing situation.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

TIMOTHY RAMIS, representing *Lanphere Enterprises*, discussed concerns with the access issue and the landscape plan and mentioned a letter from John Rosenberger from Washington County indicating his willingness to coordinate with the pending Lanphere application for the Development Review of the site located on the north side of Millikan Way.

TIM BRUNNER, representing *The Axis Design Group*, indicated the map location of the pending Lanphere application site on the north side of Millikan Way.

Mr. Ramis pointed out that while generalized agreements are acceptable to some extent, any revisions could create a problem in the future. He expressed concern with accesses, specifically the size and locations of these accesses on Hocken Avenue, Millikan Way and Cedar Hills Boulevard. He discussed issues regarding the landscaping plan, observing that *Lanphere Enterprises* concurs with Washington County's plans regarding the sidewalk. Observing that his client does object to the plans regarding the street trees, he pointed out that these particular trees have a tendency to drip a lot, which is not particularly advantageous when parking cars, particularly new cars that are for sale or being serviced. He mentioned the absence of any street trees along Hocken Avenue, expressing his opinion that although this might not be an actual requirement, it involves an obvious deficiency that needs to be addressed.

Chairman Lemon advised Mr. Ramis that members of the Board of Design Review unfortunately had not received his Memorandums and comments until 6:31 p.m. today because the comments had not been submitted prior to the Public Hearing. The Board briefly discussed the proposed locations for the access points.

RANDY WOOLEY, City Transportation Engineer, observed that Hocken Boulevard north of Millikan Way is actually a Washington County facility, adding that the street and access is located outside the City of Beaverton, adding that while the county would actually govern on that particular access, this would come up through the Design Review Process when the Lanphere property is developed.

Chairman Lemon expressed his concern with an applicant paying to have something done that would not meet future City requirements.

Mr. Wooley commented that he had understood that there had been agreement on the Millikan Way access location, adding that this access needed to be located at the far easterly portion of the *Lanphere Enterprises* property in order to allow sufficient room from the Hocken Boulevard intersection. He explained the necessity of locating the Hocken access as far as possible from the light rail crossing, adding that he anticipates some proposals on turn restrictions.

Mr. Ramis assured Chairman Lemon that *Lanphere Enterprise* would not disagree with any proposed turn restrictions, adding that he believes that there has been some agreement between the involved parties regarding these locations. He pointed out that the reference to the City process had been included simply to clarify that these issues need to be determined at a City level.

Mr. Wooley commented that the City would make the required determination anyway, emphasizing that there has been a request for a guarantee of three access points.

Mr. Barkouli pointed out that the applicant understands but does not agree with this requirement.

Chairman Lemon advised Mr. Barkouli that the applicant would have an opportunity for rebuttal.

On request, Mr. Brunner was shown the proposed location of the mutually agreed access off of Millikan Way.

Following some discussion, Chairman Lemon described the Public Hearing procedure, specifically noting that the applicant would be provided an opportunity for rebuttal following any public testimony.

Mr. Brunner discussed problems with the proposed access design, specifically on-site circulation issues that Lanphere has had to address. He pointed out that an existing building on the property has created what he referred to as a pinch-point with the curve of the road to the corner of the building, expressing concern with the required safe on-site circulation. He discussed the possibility of providing some input regarding the landscape design in the public right-of-way, allowing for coordination of the landscaping that would be installed on their property and to provide assistance with the shielding of headlights and other appropriate safety issues.

Mr. Nardozza requested clarification of *Lanphere Enterprise's* objection to the Green Mountain Maple.

Mr. Ramis advised Mr. Nardozza that *Lanphere Enterprise* has had similar trees on their site in the past, adding that while he is not familiar with the growth cycle, they have a tendency to be quite messy due to droppings and sap. He expressed his surprise at being informed that there is any problem with the use of the Cedar Hills Boulevard access, observing that a portion of the County's plan appears to be to allow access to the adjoining properties during the construction process in order to reduce the cost of the condemnation.

WILL SCHRADER, representing *Midas Auto Service*, expressed appreciation to the members of the Board of Design Review for addressing their concerns and expressed his opinion that the applicant had made revisions that adequately meets the need for traffic circulation around the block. He discussed his concerns with appropriate signage and made several suggestions to address this issue, adding that he is in support of this design as adequate for the local businesses that would be affected.

PAUL HESSICK, representing *Falk Hardware*, expressed his appreciation to the Board of Design Review for considering their concerns, adding that he feels that this is a good solution to a bad situation at this intersection. He discussed his concern with traffic heading west on Millikan Way, specifically preventing

vehicles from turning north onto Lloyd Street, observing that the recommended concrete traffic separator crosses the driveway at the rear of the property that allows access for their delivery trucks. He noted that of five businesses located in this building, only two have large trucks that utilize this area.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL:

Mr. Barkouli clarified that the proposed plans include a fence on the retaining wall, and advised Mr. Ramis that basically Washington County has agreed to a right-in, right-out situation on Hocken Street, as specified in a letter at the previous Public Hearing. Observing that there had been no discussion regarding Cedar Hills Boulevard, he noted that this facility is basically under the jurisdiction of the City of Beaverton and that Washington County has no plans for any construction in this area. He emphasized that he does not see any connection between this particular application and what is occurring on Cedar Hills Boulevard, adding that the applicant would not agree with this particular Condition of Approval, which they had not seen prior to tonight. He discussed a Letter of Commitment from the County Engineer outlining provisions for right-in and right-out on Hocken Street, adding that every effort would be made to coordinate the location and other issues with *Lanphere Enterprises*. He emphasized that Washington County is strongly opposed to reducing the width of the sidewalk, observing that this would not create a safe situation. He pointed out that the landscape architect had advised him that the tree species suggested by *Lanphere Enterprises* have a greater capacity for dripping than the Green Mountain Maple proposed by the applicant. Concluding, he offered to respond to any questions or comments regarding the issues raised.

Chairman Lemon brought up the issue of directional signage for Cedar Hills Boulevard.

Mr. Barkouli recommended that additional signage not be included, expressing his opinion that excessive signage could create greater confusion. He addressed Mr. Hessick's concerns with truck traffic, observing that while the situation is not ideal and that there is a potential for conflict, in order to provide the connection between Lloyd Avenue, Henry Street and Millikan Way, it is necessary to construct the six-inch raised median. He emphasized the necessity of balancing the issues, pointing out that there is no easy solution.

Observing that it is necessary to decide whether or not to reopen the Public Hearing for public testimony, Chairman Lemon expressed his intention to stick with the rules.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Osterberg reminded the members of the Board of Design Review that the Hocken Street access point to the Lanphere property is not located within the City of Beaverton, although their private property is located within City boundaries.

He discussed the Cedar Hills Boulevard access, observing that because this had not been previously discussed at the Public Hearing on February 8, 2001, it should not be discussed at this time. He added that he had anticipated that Mr. Ramis would submit a Condition of Approval that would address issues with the other two access points or issues that were interrelated with both access and landscaping. He discussed the proposed fencing on top of the retaining wall, noting that although the applicant's written statement had indicated that no fencing was proposed, his recommendation would be for black or dark brown vinyl-coated chain link fencing.

Mr. Wooley commented that while he is not certain what is accomplished through the Condition of Approval for the accesses, he has no objection, although he does suggest the deletion of the reference to Cedar Hills Boulevard, which is not subject to this particular application. He pointed out that he does expect that appropriate and adequate signage would be provided, expressing his opinion that the signs for Cedar Hills Boulevard should be considered at a later time. He requested that signage not be included in the land use order, emphasizing that this is extremely difficult to adjust at a future time when it might become necessary.

Mr. Edberg expressed his opinion that this project consists of a great deal of compromises and that no perfect solution is available, observing that the letter from Mr. Ramis regarding the three access points is not necessary. Emphasizing that he is not an expert on trees, he commented that he is reluctant to force a particular tree on this project.

Mr. Nardoza expressed his agreement with Mr. Edberg regarding the tree issue, observing that availability of certain trees is always a problem. He suggested that the Board of Design Review not interfere with issues regarding the trees or the access points, requesting that a small "To Cedar Hills" sign be located at an appropriate location. He noted that the chain link fences and proposed barriers are appropriate.

Ms. Crane expressed her agreement with Mr. Nardoza on the tree issues and signage, adding that the barricade is a necessary safety element for the project.

Observing that he is not a landscape architect, Chairman Lemon expressed his opinion that the trees should be consistent throughout the area. Referring to the proposed Condition of Approval regarding the access, he pointed out that this particular application does not actually involve Cedar Hills Boulevard or Hocken Street where those streets are adjacent to *Lanphere Enterprises*. He pointed out that since Cedar Hills Boulevard had not been discussed and included in the minutes of the Public Hearing of February 8, 2001, he would not agree to include this issue in the Conditions of Approval at this time.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Ms. Crane **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2000-0165 -- SW Millikan Way Extension Type 3 Design Review, based upon

the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the Public Hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated February 1, 2001, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 14; and Staff Memorandum dated March 1, 2001, with additional Conditions of Approval, as follows:

15. Add a northbound connection from the intersection of Lloyd Avenue and Henry Street to the new Millikan Way Extension, as shown conceptually in applicant's Exhibit "A", dated February 28, 2001. At Millikan Way, the connection will be restricted to only right turns;
16. Add a raised island in the center lane of Millikan Way, as shown conceptually in applicant's Exhibit "B", dated March 1, 2001;
17. The marking of a mid-block pedestrian crossing is not required; and
18. Where approved, chain link fencing shall be black vinyl-coated.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

8:14 p.m. to 8:20 p.m. – break.

8:22 p.m. Mr. Osterberg left.

C. BDR 2000-0148 -- TREASURE ISLAND CHINESE RESTAURANT

(Continued from February 8, 2001)

The following land use application has been submitted Design Review Approval for the development of a new restaurant at 15930 SW Regatta Lane for an approximately 5, 400 square foot building, associated landscaping, parking and sidewalks. The development proposal is located on Assessor's Map 1S1-05BA, on Tax Lot 1600. The site is zoned Office Commercial (OC) and is approximately 0.7 acres.

Mr. Ryerson presented the Staff Report and materials board and discussed the reasons that this application had been continued, including the desire of the Planning Commission for additional time for review of the Conditional Use Permit application on a number of issues that have since been resolved, adding that they had approved the project. He described the proposal for an approximately 5,400 square foot, 223-seat, dine-in restaurant and associated parking and landscaping, observing that the applicant had slightly reduced the size of the building in order to accommodate a turnaround at the southeast corner of the site. Observing that he has submitted a materials board and some revisions to the site plan, including some minor changes to the landscaping, he pointed out that there is also some revision to the sidewalk at the back of the building, allowing access to the parking lot. He described the access points and the features of the project, including the materials, color scheme and landscaping.

Concluding, he recommended approval and offered to respond to any questions or comments.

APPLICANT:

DENNIS BOLSINGER, representing D'Bol & Associates, on behalf of the applicant, described the numerous scenarios that had been reviewed before determining that the best solution would be to locate the building at the rear of the property with the parking at the front, adding that the neighborhood had objected. Observing that the applicant would also prefer a different parking situation, he noted that they are hoping to eventually obtain an ingress/egress to the adjoining property. He discussed what he described as heavy landscaping, adding that the applicant is attempting to achieve a more mature and possibly less dominant appearance.

Ms. Crane expressed concern with the proposed color scheme, observing that often if the tones are not varied enough the result appears to not match.

Mr. Bolsinger advised Ms. Crane that the color scheme is not actually etched in concrete, noting that the applicant intends to create a monument base around the bottom that would be darker than the rest of the building. He assured her that the applicant would take her suggestions into consideration, adding that revisions should not create a problem.

Chairman Lemon suggested that Mr. Bolsinger and Ms. Crane discuss and determine a mutually acceptable color scheme during a short break prior to the motion-making process for approval. He expressed concern with the bicycle parking issue, specifically the location that could create problems in the event of an emergency, and made suggestions for revisions.

Mr. Ryerson described several options that had been discussed that could address the bicycle parking issue, observing that his main concern is with the short-term bicycle parking. He discussed the possibility of relocating the short-term bicycle parking along the eastern property line, adding that sufficient sidewalk space should also be maintained.

Chairman Lemon discussed his concerns with locating bicycle parking where it might interfere with pedestrians, wheelchairs and walkers, pointing out that the bicycles could also create an attractive nuisance for children in the area.

8:52 p.m. to 8:58 p.m. – break.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no member of the public appeared to testify on this issue.

On question, staff had no further comments at this time.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2000-0148 -- Treasure Island Chinese Restaurant Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated January 4, 2001, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 20, plus additional Conditions of Approval, as follows:

21. Move short-term bicycle parking to the east side of the building. Add benches, in lieu of bicycle racks, as shown in front of the building; and
22. Colors, as revised in Exhibit "A".

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

B. BDR 2000-0174 -- MURRAYHILL PUMP STATION

This land use application has been submitted for the proposed expansion of an existing water works facility at 10835 SW 155th Avenue, located near the intersection of SW 155th Avenue and SW Falcon Drive. The site is specifically identified on Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-32BC, Tax Lot 200, is zoned Urban Standard Density (R-5), and is approximately 13 acres in size. The request for Design Review approval is for the construction of a 20-foot by 18-foot single story building to house an existing drinking water pump station, the addition of water booster pumps, and upgrades to the existing pump station. The application also proposes associated landscaping, paving and utilities.

Mr. Ryerson presented the Staff Report and described the project, including the construction of a drinking water pump house, addition of water booster pumps, upgrades to the existing pump station, landscaping, paving and utilities. He observed that the related applications for a Conditional Use Permit and a Flexible Setback have been approved by the Planning Commission. He discussed the purpose of the project, specifically the establishment of this pump station as a permanent facility, which will provide back-up water for domestic use and fire protection during power outages, as well as the maintenance of stable water pressure in the upper elevations of southwest Beaverton during peak demands. Concluding, recommended approval and offered to respond to any questions or comments.

APPLICANT:

LAURA JACKSON, representing *W & H Pacific*, on behalf of the applicant, the City of Beaverton, advised Mr. Ryerson that only one light is proposed, observing that it would be on an motion detector and located over the entrance to the building. She described the expansion and proposed utilization of this pump station, emphasizing the necessity of enclosing this equipment for protection against the elements and potential vandalism. She discussed the flexible setback and features of the building and efforts to create a facility that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Concluding, she offered to respond to any questions or comments.

Chairman Lemon requested further information regarding the lighting and motion sensors, expressing concern with these sensors being activated by wildlife.

DAVID WINSHIP, City Utilities Engineer for the City of Beaverton, advised Chairman Lemon that these motion sensors are optional, adding that he anticipates that cats or other animals would activate these lights periodically. He noted that the purpose of these lights would mainly be for the prevention of vandalism as well as providing lighting in the event that crews need to enter the building during the night.

Mr. Ryerson pointed out that the Murrayhill Homeowner's Association is supportive of the motion sensor lighting that has been proposed, adding that this could discourage children from hanging around the driveway during the night.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no member of the public appeared to testify on this issue.

On question, staff had no further comments at this time.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2000-0174 -- Murrayhill Pump Station Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated March 1, 2001, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 17, plus additional Conditions of Approval, as follows:

18. The revised landscape plan, as noted, as Exhibit "A", and
19. The new color board, as presented, and identified as Exhibit "B".

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of February 8, 2001, as written, were submitted. Chairman Lemon asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Edberg **MOVED** and Mr. Nardozza **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Mr. Beighley and Ms. Crane, who abstained from voting on this issue.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.